

**Summary of Plenary Group Comments
Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics
Resource Action Recommendation**

Presentation/RA	Comment
LWG #19	Q: What the definition of Biomass, does it include dead debris? A: Yes
LWG #29	Q: Why was this Resource Action not considered? A: Recommendation is for further analysis. DWR is reviewing the WG discussion and will determine how to treat it in analysis. Issue may be brought up in settlement discussions.
LWG: #29	Q: This is also a socio-economic issue, please consider as such. Q: There is a large economic impact when lake can't be used, please move to the settlement list. Q: A recent ORAC meeting discussed a state/federal agreement on water levels we believe that the community is being heard if agreement stays intact and would like a comment from the State Water Contractors. Q: Recommend that this be treated in the same way that LWG #20 is and provide catch-up funds for this. Agree that it is a settlement/inter-group issue. A: Understanding is that FERC does not have the ability to enforce this kind of resource action nor does DW. SWC: this is a water rights issue, not a FERC jurisdictional issue, might be willing to support it going to settlement discussion; MWD is a leader in water conservation including low flow toilets, refer to Bulletin 160 process; we are looking at impact of operations on water levels, have studies to examine this; however, must remain focused on jurisdictional issues.

	<p>MWD uses integrated resource planning tool, looks at water mix/future demand, large % used for gray water, recycling, etc.</p> <p>Q: As commendable as water programs are, FERC does have jurisdiction over lake levels in Oroville; and this issue is appropriate for discussion in that context. License terms would only be enforceable upon the licensee not a third-party. Suggest re-phrasing to include a lake level trigger which would enable analysis.</p> <p>As written it is a goal statement, recommend re-phrasing of the statement into a PM&E that is under the licensees control.</p> <p>One suggestion: In future contracts between DWR and the SWC the delivery of minimal amounts of water in dry years with low lake levels could be contingent on or trigger demonstration of conservation programs.</p> <p>Q: The driver is the demand on project please refer to Bulletin 132-89, page 194, September, 1989.</p> <p>Q: Given these questions is it appropriate to forward to the PDEA?</p> <p>A: LWG #29 will go back to the Work Group for clarification and then come back to the Plenary Group.</p> <p>Q: Plenary forwards for analysis or not? Does the Plenary Group have authority to forward or not?</p> <p>Q: Being studied in EWG, RWG and modeling effort? It is already being analyzed.</p>
--	---

	<p>Q: Two issues: lake levels and response to lake levels. Underlying interest is with lake levels. This Resource Actions prematurely suggests a solution to address that interest.</p> <p>Q: Note: this discussion is of a water project not a hydro project.</p> <p>Q: Agree it is about lake levels and how it impacts recreation and this Resource Action is an attempt to mitigate that impact. Keeping the reservoir above 850 feet is unattainable. This Resource Action addresses what happens when it falls below and is appropriate for settlement discussions.</p> <p>Q: Submitted this Resource Action to think outside the box and put it on the settlement list. Believe it is cost-effective. Please refer to the original Resource Action form submitted to DWR.</p> <p>Q: Conservation effort should extend to all water rights holders including those in front of SWC.</p>
--	---